

Interview Summary

Application No.

Applicant(s)

09/12/814

Dohi et al.

Examiner

Hysia Bermuda

Group Art Unit

1615

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(11) Waddell Biggart

(3) Gollamudi Kishore

(2) Noriyoshi Aoki

(4) Alycia Berman

Date of Interview 1/12/00

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: As of record

Identification of prior art discussed:

as a record

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Suzuki is a wet process as opposed to dry process of application, so Suzuki particles are different, it would appear that drug distribution is more on the insoluble base than on the gel-forming base since the process involves co-grinding of the drug with the insoluble base and then mixed with the gel-forming base (for example, claim 30; product-by-process). ~~As Mr. Biggart discussed~~ the distinction between Suzuki particles and applicants plasma drug levels based on the product formed by this process, therefore the examiner indicated to possible allowability of claims drawn to product-by-process after a search for dry grinding process. Further amendments to these claims will be suggested based on the new search, if necessary.
(A fuller description if necessary, and a copy of the amendments if available, must be submitted.)

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

48
Schmidt S. ...
Primary Examiner
Group 1600